



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,898	04/17/2000	Hirokazu Aoshima	ASA-878	1272
24956	7590	01/17/2006		
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER BURGESS, BARBARA N	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/550,898	Applicant(s) AOSHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Barbara N. Burgess	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,14-40 and 57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,14-40 and 57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Election/Restriction filed October 18, 2005. Group I, consisting of claims 1, 3-12, 14-40, and 57, has been elected by Applicant. These claims are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-12, 14, 16-17, 22-25, 28-33, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duursma et al. (hereinafter "Duursma", US 2002/0103884 A1) in view of Levergood et al. (hereinafter "Levergood", 5,708,780).

As per claims 1, 12, 25, 30 32-33, Duursma discloses an information distributing method of distributing information via a communication path to an information user unit from a first information providing resource unit and a second information providing resource unit, in said second information providing resource unit, said method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2157

- Receiving a program request from the information user unit which has received first information from a first information providing resource unit (paragraphs [0046], [0047]);
- Transmitting a predetermined program code to the information user unit according to the program request (paragraphs [0046], [0047]);
- Receiving an information request from said information user unit, said information request requesting said second information providing resource unit to transmit second information to said information user unit, said first information containing a link to said second information, said information request being transmitted from said information user unit based on an execution of the program code in said information user unit (paragraphs [0047], [0048], [0049]).

Duursma does not explicitly disclose:

- Determining in response to the second request whether or not the second request is allowed according to at least identifying information (URI) included in the second request;
- Information indicating a correspondence between an identifier code (ID) specifying second information for which quotation is allowed in the second information providing resource and an identifier of first information in the first information providing source;
- Identifying information (URI) identifying said first information;

Art Unit: 2157

However, the use and advantages for determining whether a request is allowed according to at least an identifying information (URI) and the URI identifying first information is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Levergood (column 3, lines 34-65, column 4, lines 10-19, 25-28, column 5, lines 30-55, 63-65, column 6, lines 1-10, 21-25, 27-33, 37-40, 60-65, column 7, lines 15-20, 25-27, 38-46, column 8, lines 5-14).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate determining whether or not a request is allowed according to the URI and the URI identifying the first information in Duursma's method in order to identify if a client is allowed to have access to all controlled files within a protection domain.

As per claims 3, 14, 26, 35, Duursma further discloses wherein:

- The program code has a password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]);
- Second request includes an identifier code to identify the second information to be quoted and the password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]);
- Determining step further includes a step of collating the password in the second request received from the information user unit with a valid password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 4, 17, 36, 57, Duursma discloses wherein the determining step allows:

- The identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 5, 16, and 37, Duursma further discloses including a step:

- Frequently changing a password in a program code to be sent to the information user unit (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 9, 22, Duursma discloses an information distributing method according to Claim 1, wherein when the first information providing resource is a first server and the second information providing resource is a second server, the first server distributes the first information via the communication path to a client as the information user unit (paragraphs [0047-0049]).

Duursma does not explicitly disclose the second server distributes, if the determining step allows the second request, the second information quoted in the first information to the client.

However, the use and advantages for determining whether a request is allowed according to at least an identifying information (URI) and the URI identifying first information is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Levergood (column 3, lines 34-65, column 4, lines 10-19, 25-28, column 5, lines 30-55, 63-65, column 6, lines 1-10, 21-25, 27-33, 37-40, 60-65, column 7, lines 15-20, 25-27, 38-46, column 8, lines 5-14).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate determining whether or not a request is allowed according to the URI and the URI identifying the first information in Duursma's method in order to identify if a client is allowed to have access to all controlled files within a protection domain.

As per claims 10, 23, Duursma does not explicitly disclose an information distributing method according to claim 9, wherein the second server conducts the transmission of the program code and the determining step of allowance of the second request by a web server program.

However, the use and advantages for determining whether a request is allowed according to at least an identifying information (URI) and the URI identifying first information is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Levergood (column 3, lines 34-65, column 4, lines 10-19, 25-28, column 5, lines 30-55, 63-65, column 6, lines 1-10, 21-25, 27-33, 37-40, 60-65, column 7, lines 15-20, 25-27, 38-46, column 8, lines 5-14).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate determining whether or not a request is allowed according to the URI and the URI identifying the first information in Duursma's method in order to identify if a client is allowed to have access to all controlled files within a protection domain.

As per claims 11, 24, and 29, Duursma discloses:

- When the first information providing resource and the second information providing resource are implemented by a common server, said server distributes the first information via the communication path to a client as the information user unit and distributes, if the determining step allows the second request, the second information quoted in the first information to the client (paragraphs [0031], [0038], [0042], [0043]).

As per claim 28, Duursma discloses an information receiving method according to claim 25, wherein when the first information providing resource is a first server and the second information providing resource is a second server (paragraphs [0048-0049]).

Duursma does not explicitly disclose a client as the information user unit receives the first information via the communication path from the first server and receives from the second server the second information quoted in the first information and allowed for transmission.

However, the use and advantages for determining whether a request is allowed according to at least an identifying information (URI) and the URI identifying first information is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Levergood (column 3, lines 34-65, column 4, lines 10-19, 25-28, column 5, lines 30-55, 63-65, column 6, lines 1-10, 21-25, 27-33, 37-40, 60-65, column 7, lines 15-20, 25-27, 38-46, column 8, lines 5-14).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate determining whether or not a request is allowed according to the URI and the URI identifying the first information in Duursma's method in order to identify if a client is allowed to have access to all controlled files within a protection domain.

As per claim 31, Duursma discloses an information user unit according to Claim 30, further including means for displaying or outputting the first information and the second information simultaneously (paragraphs [0044-0045]).

3. Claims 6-8, 15, 18-21, 27, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duursma et al. (hereinafter "Duursma", US 2002/0103884 A1) in view of Levergood et al. (hereinafter "Levergood", 5,708,780) and in further view of Savage.

As per claims 6, 18, 27, 38, Duursma, in view of Levergood, does not explicitly disclose wherein:

- Program code includes an encryption key to encrypt the second request;
- Second request includes information obtained by encrypting an identifier code to identify the second information according to the encryption key;
- The determining step further includes a step of verifying to determine whether or not the second request can be decoded;

Art Unit: 2157

However, in an analogous art, Savage discloses the use of an encryption key (column 3, lines 32-54, column 5, lines 33-38, 65-67, column 6, lines 19-228, 41-46, 64-76).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate the use of an encryption key in Duursma's method so that third parties monitoring network traffic going to or coming from any of the servers in the system facility, either legally or illegally, are never able to connect an action taken by the server to the identity of a user who is connected to the server.

As per claims 7, 15, 19 and 39, Duursma further discloses wherein the determining step allows:

- Second request when the second request can be decoded and the identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 8, 20, 40, Duursma, in view of Levergood, does not explicitly disclose an information distributing method according to claim 7, further including a step of frequently changing an encryption key in program code to be sent to the information user unit.

However, in an analogous art, Savage discloses the use of an encryption key (column 3, lines 32-54, column 5, lines 33-38, 65-67, column 6, lines 19-228, 41-46, 64-76).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate the use of an encryption key in Duursma's method so that third parties monitoring network traffic going to or coming from any of the servers in the system facility, either legally or illegally, are never able to connect an action taken by the server to the identity of a user who is connected to the server.

As per claim 21, Duursma further discloses:

- Including a database for storing therein a certain number of previous encryption keys and a current encryption key (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Ettinene can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/550,898
Art Unit: 2157

Page 11

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

January 9, 2006


ARIO ETIENNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER